

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/983,029	Applicant(s) OISHI, KEIICHIRO	
	Examiner Sikyin Ip	Art Unit 1742	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Sikyin Ip. (3) Joerg-Uwe Szpil.
 (2) Wesley Ashton, Reg# 47,395. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 July 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ Color Micrograph from Declaration
Exh. A-D.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: All.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

* Discussed declaration, specifically Example 6 and Comp. 9.1, which demonstrate that the phases claimed are not inherent to the composition. Also discussed was superiority of claimed compositions 5 and 6 with respect to Nakamura Comp. Ex. 4. Color Micrographs were discussed.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

E
 Examiner's signature, if required